

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 18 and cancelled Claims 36-38. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Thus, Claims 1-35 remain pending in this application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed May 31, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 36 and 37 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 44 and 45 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/733,742. Applicant has cancelled Claims 36 and 37. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-9, 15-17, 18-26 and 32-34 stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,697 ("Shen"). Claims 10-14, 27-31 and 35 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,697 ("Shen") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0194219 ("Bradley"). Applicant has amended Claim 1 and 18. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shen does not disclose all the limitations of Claim 1, specifically: registering a set of modules; evaluating a set of parameters of a request, wherein each parameter is evaluated by a corresponding module; creating a signature based on the evaluation of the set of parameters by each of the corresponding modules; searching for responsive content in a cache based on the signature; and if no responsive content is found in the cache, generating responsive content, storing the responsive content in the cache and storing metadata in conjunction with the responsive content such that the request can be generated from the metadata, wherein the metadata is obtained from the evaluation of one or more of the set of parameters by the corresponding module. Claims 18 and 35 recite limitations similar to Claim 1. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 18, 35 and their dependent Claims 2-17, and 19-34.

Claims 36-38 on stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,024,452 ("O'Connell"). Applicant has cancelled Claims 36-38, accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-35. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant



Ari G. Akmal
Reg. No. 51,388

Date: August 31, 2006

1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088